

**REMARKS**

In the July 14, 2004 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-8 were pending in the application; required labeling of Fig. 1 as "Prior Art"; and rejected claims 1-8 under 35 USC § 103 as unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art" in view of Japanese Patent Publication No. 07-28854 to Masayoshi et al. (Reference AG in the Information Disclosure Statement filed March 26, 2002). Claims 2, 3, 6 and 7 have been cancelled and claims 9-12 have been added. Thus, claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-12 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

**The Application**

The Application is directed to presenting information in a list in which certain information is identified as having a higher priority and is therefore listed first and has one or more display attributes distinguishing the high priority information from the remaining information in the list, as described on, e.g., page 21 and page 25. When information is added to the list, the high priority items continued to be listed first. As described on pages 23-25, when an order is defined, such as most recent information first, first the high priority information is listed in the defined order followed by the remaining information listed in the defined order.

**Prior Art:****Japanese Patent Publication No. 7-288544 to Masayoshi et al.**

The Masayoshi et al. publication is concerned with a configuration for rating of e-mail messages with respect to their importance using the classifications of high, normal and low, where the rating rules may vary depending on addresses of the e-mail messages. The important information is displayed together with mail information to the recipient.

**Japanese Patent Publication No. 9-200254 to Koichi**

The Koichi publication is concerned with the configuration in which a computer receiving mail determines the importance of received mail using judging rules and various programs. The importance is indicated in the way in which headings are displayed, e.g., by the color used. As indicated in Fig. 6, underlining may be used to indicate that the associated mail item has not been read by the user.

## Drawings

In item 4 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner required labeling of Fig. 1 as "Prior Art". Fig. 1 has been amended as required.

## Rejections under 35 USC § 103

In item 5 on pages 3-5 of the Office Action, claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as unpatentable over "Applicant's Admitted Prior Art" in view of Masayoshi et al. as acknowledged in the application, a listing of the type illustrated in Fig. 1 was known prior to the invention. However, claims 1 and 5 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of claims 2 and 3 (and 6 and 7 in the case of claim 5) Prior to the invention, no known system, including that disclosed by Masayoshi et al. listed high priority items ahead of other items and also displayed the high priority items using different displayed attributes. While Koichi disclosed displaying important e-mail headings differently, it contains no suggestion of also listing items of greater importance ahead of other items, regardless of how the user has configured the display.

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 and 5 and claims 4 and 8 which depend therefrom patently distinguish over the prior art.

## New Claims

Claim 9 has been added to recite a method like the process recited in claim 5 as amended. Therefore, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over the prior art for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 5. Claim 10 adds that the information source is part of a groupware system. Nothing has been cited or found suggesting applying Masayoshi et al. or Koichi to a groupware system. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 10 further patentably distinguishes over the prior art. Claims 11 and 12 recite details of how a list is updated when additional information is added, as described on pages 23-25 of the application. Nothing like these operations has been found anywhere in the prior art. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 11 and 12 further patentably distinguish over the prior art.

## Summary

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1, 4, 5 and 8-12 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is

requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/15/04

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501